UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,576	11/14/2000	Ryo Yoshida	JA999144	9735

7590 03/04/2004

Blanche E Schiller Esq
Heslin & Rothenberg PC
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	6

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/712,576	YOSHIDA, RYO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Priority Papers

The Priority Papers filed on paper 4 with a priority date of November 15, 1999 have been considered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on paper 5 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols.

Regarding claim 14, a terminal device sharing (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25; col. 5, lines 17-21) method, for sharing among a plurality of clients (col. 5, lines 17-21) information concerning a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25), comprising the steps of:

employing a web browser (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) at a first client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) to designate a URL (Nichols: col. 3, lines 7-11) corresponding to said terminal device, and downloading model data (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56; col. 3, lines 1-4);

rendering said model data that are downloaded (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56);

preparing shared data by operating said model data that are rendered by said first client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 17-21), and transmitting said data used in common (Nichols: col. 5, lines 31-38);

employing a web browser (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) of a second client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) to designate a URL (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-11) corresponding to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-34), and downloading (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56) model data; and

receiving said data used in common from said first client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 49-56) and employing said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-62) used in common to update said values of said model data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-62).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-13, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 1,

The Nichols reference teaches a remote control system (Nichols: col. 2, lines 55-56) comprising:

a terminal device (Nichols: col. 2, line 55, remote device; col. 4, lines 24; mainframe computer; Figure 2, tag 22) having a control program (Nichols: col. 4, lines 25-26; management console; Figure 2; tag 24);

a server connected to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7; Figure 2, tag 20), for transmitting control data (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36).

a client connected to said server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4; Figure 2, tag 4), wherein said client performs an additional operation (Nichols: col. 4, lines 31-36; col. 6, lines 8-10; action) and transmits, to said server (Nichols: col. 6, lines 8-10), which are obtained by said additional operation (Nichols: col. 4, lines 31-36; col. 6, lines 8-10; action), and wherein said server transmits, to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 31-36), said control data based on said update data (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36) received from said client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state three-dimensional model data.

The Thackston reference teaches an interactive system capable of receiving information represented by a three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59); receiving said three-dimensional model data, upon the receipt of specific three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59), update data for changing a three-dimensional model (Thackston: col. 23, lines 18-41; col. 24, lines 15-24) for a three-dimensional model

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a collaborative engineering system utilizing three-dimensional model data as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Nichols et al and Thackston.

Regarding claim 2, the remote control system according to claim 1, wherein, based on said update data for a three-dimensional model (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) received from said client, said server transmits operation control data to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 31-36 interface for HMC), and said control program (Nichols: col. 4, line 27; HMC) of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 24; mainframe computer) interprets said operation control data for said operation of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 44-48; lines 56-57), and transmits, to said server, control data for reflecting said operating results (Nichols: col. 5, lines 57-59).

Regarding claim 3, the remote control system according to claim 2, wherein, based on said control data received from said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 44-48; lines 56-57), said server adjusts said three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59; col. 23, lines 18-41) to reflect the current state of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 59-62; col. 3, lines 29-34), and transmits the resultant three-dimensional model data to said client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 59-62).

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 4,

The Nichols reference teaches a server-client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-12) system comprising:

a server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7), a connected terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25);

a first client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) connected to said server via a network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 17-21), for calling for (Nichols: col. 5, lines 49-51) and for displaying (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) specific data that are stored in said server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4); and

a second client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 17-21) connected to said server via said network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 17-21), for employing a web browser (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4; web browser) to designate a URL (Nichols: col. 3, lines 7-11) for said specific data that are called for by said first client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 49-51), and for downloading (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56) and displaying (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) said specific data received from said server so as to share said specific data with said first client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 17-19, lines 28-34).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state three-dimensional model data.

The Thackston reference teaches an interactive system capable of receiving information represented by a three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59); consisting of a Java program file concerning specific three-dimensional model (Thackston: col. 11, lines 25-45; col. 5, lines 1-9; col. 6, lines 13-35).

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a collaborative engineering system utilizing three-dimensional model data with java as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Nichols et al and Thackston.

Regarding claim 5, the server-client system (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-12) according to claim 4, wherein said three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59), which consists of said Java program file stored in said server (Thackston: col. 11, lines 25-45), includes a program for controlling said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, line 27; HMC), and said first and said second clients display the values (Nichols: col. 5, lines 17-19, lines 28-34) of said three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) to reflect the current control state of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 59-62; col. 3, lines 29-34).

Regarding claim 6, the server-client system according to claim 4, wherein one of said first and said second clients is a computer at a customer support center that supports said terminal device (Thackston: col. 51, lines 61- col. 52, line 9).

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 7,

The Nichols reference teaches a control server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7) for a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25; mainframe computer system) comprising:

a terminal device function control program (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7 web interface, web server for col. 4, lines 30-34), for exchanging control data (Nichols: exchange between client and mainframe: col. 4, lines 30-36) for a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25; mainframe; Figure 2, tag 22) connected to an internal network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21; Figure 2) and controlling the functions of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36; col. 5, lines 38-44);

device operating data that are received by said terminal device function control program (Nichols: col. 4, lines 25-26; management console; Figure 2; tag 24) and reflect the operating results of said terminal device (Nichols: col. 3, lines 29-34; col. 5, lines 36-38); and

a module (Nichols: col. 5, lines 28-31; functions under the HMC), for recording an operation performed by a user as an operation event (col. 5, lines 38-44) and for replaying (Nichols: col. 6, lines 63-67; col. 7, lines 20-24), as needed, said operation event (col. 5, lines 38-44).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state three-dimensional model data.

The Thackston reference teaches three-dimensional model data used in a collaborative engineering project (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59), including geometrical data for said terminal device (Thackston: col. 15, lines 8-17).

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a collaborative engineering system utilizing three-dimensional model data with geometric data as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claim 8-10 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Nichols et al and Thackston.

Regarding claim 8, the control server of claim 7, (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7) wherein said module employs recording/replaying software to record (Nichols: col. 5, lines 38-44), as a VRML operation event (Nichols: col. 6, lines 63-67; last task information), an operation performed by a user that is generated via a VRML browser (Thackston: col. 10, lines 5-10), and replays and displays said VRML operation event via said VRML browser (Thackston: col. 10, lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 9, the control server according to claim 8, wherein an operation performed by said user is represented by the performance of an operation based on VRML contents (Nichols: col. 5, lines 28-47; operation actions, requests; Thackston: col. 10, lines 5-10), which are three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) written for said VRML browser using a VRML format (Thackston: col. 10, lines 5-10; format of data is tag oriented in HTML or XML or VRML).

Regarding claim 10, the control server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7) according to claim 7, further comprising:

a client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) connected to an external network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21); and

a module (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-34) for exchanging an operation event (Nichols: col. 5, lines 38-45) with said client via said external network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21).

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 11,

The Nichols reference teaches a terminal device control (Nichols: col. 4, lines 25-29) method whereby a client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) exercises remote control (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-34) of a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25) comprising the steps of:

designating a web browser (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) at said client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4) to designate a URL (Nichols: col. 3, lines 7-11) corresponding to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25), and downloading (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-54) data;

and reading a control program (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36; col. 3, lines 22-28) that is correlated through the designation of said URL (Nichols: col. 3, lines 7-11); and

transmitting operation control data to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36) in response to an operation (Nichols: col. 5, lines 38-45).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state three dimension model data.

The Thackston reference teaches three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) and rendering said three-dimensional model data that are downloaded (Thackston: col. 9, lines 62 - col. 10, line 4; col. 10, lines 23-31)

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a collaborative engineering system utilizing and rendering three-dimensional model data as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Nichols et al and Thackston.

Regarding claim 12, the terminal device control (Nichols: col. 4, lines 25-29) method according to claim 11, wherein said step of transmitting said operation control data (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36) to said terminal device includes the steps of:

transmitting, to a server (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7), an update value (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36; col. 5, lines 38-48) of said three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) obtained by said client (Nichols: col. 3, lines 1-4); and

employing said update value (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36) to transmit said operation control data from said server to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 45-47; col. 4, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 13, the terminal device control (Nichols: col. 4, lines 25-29) method according to claim 11, further comprising the steps of:

transmitting control data for reflecting operating results from said terminal device to said server (Nichols: col. 5, lines 59-62; col. 3, lines 29-34); and

reflecting said control data to said three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59), and transmitting the resultant three-dimensional model data (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) from said server to said client (Nichols: col. 5, lines 59-62).

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 15,

The Nichols reference teaches storage media on which a computer stores a computer-readable program (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7; web server) that permits said computer to perform:

a process of calling for data concerning a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25) connected to a network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21);

a process of rendering said data that has been called for (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56);

a process, of calling for a control file associated with said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-56; requests); and

a process of receiving control data from said terminal device (Nichols: col. 5, lines 57-59) and of reflecting the received control data (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36) to said data (Thackston: col. 23, lines 18-41; col. 24, lines 15-24).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state three dimension model data.

The Thackston reference teaches using three-dimensional model data in a collaborative engineering device (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) and rendering the data (Thackston: col. 9, lines 62 - col. 10, line 4; col. 10, lines 23-31).

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a three dimension model and rending the data as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claims 16 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Nichols et al and Thackston.

Regarding claim 16, storage media according to claim 15, wherein said computer-readable program further comprises: a process of receiving updated values (Nichols: col. 5, lines 63-65, lines 53-56) of three-dimensional model (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59) data from a client (Nichols: col. 5, line 63; user) connected to an external network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21), and of transmitting said control data to said terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 30-36).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 17,

The Nichols reference teaches a storage media on which a computer stores a computer-executable program (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7; web server) that permits said computer to perform:

a process of calling for the transmission, via an external network (Nichols: col. 3, lines 20-21), of data concerning a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25);

a process of rendering said data that is called for (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-56; requests; col. 1, lines 53-56);

a process of calling for a control file associated with said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-56; requests);

a process of reflecting said control file to values of said data (Nichols: col. 6, lines 39-51); and

a process of changing the values of said data based on the operation for said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-65).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state the use of three dimensional model data.

The Thackston reference teaches a three-dimensional model employed in a collaborate engineering system (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59).

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a three dimension model as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,138,150 by Nichols et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 by Thackston.

Regarding claim 18,

The Nichols reference teaches a program transmission apparatus (Nichols: col. 2, lines 53-55) comprising:

storage means for storing a program that executes a process of calling for the transmission (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-56; requests), via an external network (Nichols: col. 3,

lines 20-21), of data concerning a terminal device (Nichols: col. 4, lines 23-25), a process of rendering said data (Nichols: col. 1, lines 53-56; col. 5, lines 53-56) that has been called for, a process of calling for a control file associated with said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-56; requests), a process of reflecting the values in said control file to the values of said data (Nichols: col. 6, lines 39-51; updates), and a process of changing the values of said data based an operation performed by a user for said data (Nichols: col. 5, lines 53-65); and

transmission means for reading said program from said storage means and for transmitting said program to an external computer (Nichols: col. 3, lines 4-7; web server; col. 4, lines 30-36 interface for HMC).

The Nichols reference does not explicitly state the use three dimensional model data.

The Thackston reference teaches a three-dimensional model employed in a collaborate engineering system (Thackston: col. 3, lines 53-59).

The Thackston reference further teaches collaborative engineering design overcomes issues of boundaries and reduces significant costs and obstacles associated with it (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the remote control system as taught by Nichols while employing a three dimension model as taught by Thackston in order to overcome physical, business, and format boundaries and reduce cost and obstacles (Thackston: col. 2, lines 42-59).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 5,999,944 issued to Lipkin et al. This reference teaches more explicit details of using VRML in a virtual world and using to navigate. This reference will detail more VRML operations.

U.S. Patent No. 6,584,376 issued to Van Kommer teaches a mobil robot and method for controlling a robot. This reference details the use of java in controlling a robot through a terminal over a network.

U.S. Patent No. 4,855,822 issued to Narendra et al teaches a human engineered remote driving system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
March 1, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER